

up all night last Oct 3,
writing diff. letter to Blight;
call Kline, then Sherrin, Sunday
4 Oct; SH confirm No; Kline
calls from Havana;

1 Oct 87 Thu

[notes on assumption that

To Blight:

SH will release — ^{or Oct 2 Oct 3}
there were details on Fri, Oct 2; (or O - Nov 12-13)
reassured today, 5 Oct; he will
give WP. Blight proposes 1 + 2

big Numb:

letter was

informing:

not the way

given - people

able to read;

Talked to me

later - called

(a, an unusual

statement or

applicant/sufficient

(judge to convicted

below)

S & N are right - a public review is not the

way for me to release this info

- for me, or for Harvard

- primarily because I ^{can't} reveal y evidence

(like PP!) without endangering myself and Harvard
(= RAND)

- yet evidence is needed, for proper report.

But the same applies to Blight Proposal 3:

paper, private review, publication;

which would also be too slow to enlarge the

debate this fall. ("Lesson learned" is left - now

will stick for quite a while, give brief, intense

public attention.

Still S & N - thanks - but all proposals come from one of myself - "like
S - and I agree, cooperation with the rejection" Woodward

Only solution to my narrow aim:

- formalistic investigation (X) (academic, "official"
approach can't get at these data, probably,
and couldn't afford, institutionally, to publish it!)

(X)

- Opened prime of me, refer

~~Full from to committee of WGBH think~~
(and) to apologize

I will gladly share my conclusions + interp
with anyone now, so they can relate to it as a
hypo - (Can understand why Blight found it plausible
enough without precise evidence).

- Please read - -

, Happy to participate in, or lead, review discussion.

- Letter (or any time) review - NO resolutions, no press -
on "Cuba II. Model IV" or VN '65, '69-73. Am Rev. Model IV